Compliments of the Editor

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS MAR 6 1914

The Reply

$1.00 Yearly | January, 1914 | 10 Cents Copy

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

New York

New Canaan, Conn.

Volume 1

Number 9

Entered as second-class matter July 22, 1913, at the Post Office at New Canaan, Conn., under the Act of March 3, 1879

VOTES

Won't Raise Wages!

Anyone who tells you that they do, is only fooling you. You don't want to be anyone's fool, do you?

Voting is politics; the wage is political economy, an entirely different matter.

Carpenters, plumbers, and other workmen never undertake to raise their wages through votes, because they know it simply cannot be done.

Drug clerks, grocery clerks, drivers of express company wagons and other classes of men work very long hours for very small wages and yet they have votes.

Letter carriers have no pensions, they also have votes.

Votes don't help the men voters to shorter hours or more pay and it is impossible that votes can increase your wages, or shorten your hours. The only way your wages will be increased is by your becoming efficient.

Don't be fooled by the Suffragists who mislead you in regard to what votes can do for you.

Sample of

"Dodger" for Distribution

For Sale Through "The Reply." Prices on Application

The Reply

Helen S. Harman-Brown, Editor and Publisher

PUBLISHED MONTHLY AT NEW CANAAN, CONNECTICUT
ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO "THE REPLY," BOX 1526, NEW CANAAN, CONN.

PRINTED AT THE MAC-A-NAN PRESS, NEW CANAAN, CONN.
THE REPLY IS ON SALE AT BRENTANO'S, FIFTH AVENUE AND TWENTY-SEVENTH ST., NEW YORK

THE REPLY is also on sale at Brentano's, F. and Twelfth Streets, Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

Frontispiece—Mrs. Henry Seligman

Editorial		197
Today and Tomorrow	By Margaret Doane Gardiner	199
Rossiter Johnson's Address Before Committee on Rules		200
Woman's Part in Civilization	By J. T. W.	202
A Parallel	———	204
The Woman Socialist and the Woman Suffragette	By F. G. R. Gordon	205
Report of the Hearing Before the Committee on Rules	———	206
Sir Almoth E. Wright's Famous Letter to the London Times	———	208
Press News and Notes		215
Book Reviews and Notes		217
Anti-Suffrage Organizations		219

As the financial support of a magazine comes largely from its success as an advertising medium, we trust that all who want to help the work which THE REPLY has undertaken, will not only read all its advertisements, but patronize its carefully selected advertisers

Current News-Talks for Busy People

By Mrs. Josephine Redding, Editorial Staff of Vogue

Series of Ten Lectures on Tuesdays, beginning October 28, 1913, at 4:15 p. m. Hotel McAlpin, 34th St. and Broadway, New York

Course tickets, five dollars Single tickets, seventy-five cents

---

REPRESENTATIVE WANTED
For The Reply

We want a representative in every community for THE REPLY and will pay a liberal commission for every new subscriber added to our list. Also cash prizes for every fifty subscriptions

This is a splendid opportunity for some one to earn a little extra money. If there is no agent in your town, can you suggest someone with whom we can correspond

Name of Possible Representative

_____

Address_____

For further particulars write

The Reply New Canaan, Conn.

P. O. Box 1526

The Original Vacuum Washer

PRICE, $3.50

Can be secured with one year's subscription to The Repky for $2.50

Make cheque or money order payable to

THE REPLY

P. O. Box 1526

New Canaan, Conn.

THE REPLY'S SUFFRAGE CANVASS

Help us to learn the Will of the People, by answering the following question and mailing to "The Reply," Box 1526, New Canaan, Conn:

Do You Want Woman Suffrage for the United States?

Signature_____

Address_____

Date_____

Result will be published July 1914

Parcels Post makes shopping by mail easy. Why not write, as well as visit our advertisers

Good Reading---Recent Books

The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage
Sir Almroth E. Wright, M. D., F. R. S. $1.00

The Vocation of Woman
Mrs. Archibald Colquhoun MacMillan $1.50

Woman and the Republic
Helen Kendrick Johnson. Price, by mail 30c.

The Unrest of Women
Edward Sanford Martin. D. Appleton & Co. $1.00

Votes for Men
—— Duffield Co. 50c.

The Ladies Battle
Mollie Elliott Seawell. McMillan Co. $1.00

Woman Adrift
Harold Owen. E. P. Dutton & Co. $1.50

Anti-Suffrage. Ten Good Reasons
Grace Duffield Goodwin. Duffield Co. 50c.

The Business of Being a Woman
Ida M. Tarbell. McMillan Co. $1.25

The Wrong and Peril of Woman Suffrage
James M. Buckley, LL. D. Fleming H. Revell Co. 75c.

A Miscellany of Men
Gilbert Chesterton. Dodd Mead Co. $1.50

Magazines

The Woman's Protest
Published monthly by the National Association Opposed to Women Suffrage, 37 West 39th Street, New York. Single copies, 10c; subscription, $1 per year.

The Remonstrance
Published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. Room 615 Kensington Building, Boston. Subscription price, 25c per year

Anti-Suffrage Review
515 Caxton House, Westminster, London, Eng. Price, one penny

The Trained Nurse
Published monthly by the Lakeside Pub. Co., 38-40 West 32d Street, New York. Single copies 20c; subscription price $2 per year.

Glaube und Tat
A German evangelical monthly. Taubenstrasse, 23 Frankfort-on-Main

Monatsblatt des Deutschen Bundes zur Bekaempfung der Frauenemanzipation
Rubenstrasse 21, Berlin-Friedenau

The Live Issue
Published weekly by the Social Reform Press, 131 East 23d Street, New York City. Subscription rates, one year, 50c.

Housewives League Magazine
Published monthly by the Housewives League Magazine, Inc., 31 East 27th Street, New York. Single copies, 10c; subscription price, $1 per year.

MRS. HENRY SELIGMAN

Who is One of the Directors of the Woman's Municipal League, Honorary Vice-President of the Guidon Club and a Member of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

The Reply

An Anti-Suffrage Magazine

January, 1914

EDITORIAL

IT WAS our privilege to be present at a meeting of the New Jersey State Association Opposed to Women Suffrage when the Chairman, one of the most graceful presiding officers to whom it has been our privilege to listen, closed his introductory remarks somewhat as follows: "If Feminism means the progress of women in all that gives her education and happiness, then I am in favor of Feminism." That this new doctrine should be so little understood in our land of contented (with the exception of the 8% demanding Suffrage) womanhood is not surprising, for the education the American woman is seeking (and receiving) is not given to her for the purpose of fitting her "for contest with man," as, says Mr. W. L. George, in the December Atlantic, is the purpose of Feminism. Mr. George, a prominent spokesman of this movement in England, makes clear to his readers the attitude of the Feminists, and so startling are his statements that we feel that the real meaning of these teachings should be so clearly understood, that there will be no future danger of this evil thing being spread in our land by anyone interpreting it as a thing to be desired. Mr. George is absolutely honest in his confession of the "faith that is in him" and he frankly condemns those, who took him to task, for, as they claim, letting "the cat out of the bag," in his former book, "Woman and To-Morrow," but he says, "as a convinced, but cautious Feminist, I do not think it advisable or honest to conceal the fact "that the methods of Feminism are to have revolutionary results, are destined to be revolutionary." "Feminists," he says, "should not want to triumph by fraud. As promoters of a sex war, they should not hesitate to declare it, and I have little sympathy with the pretences of those who contend that one may alter everything while leaving everything unaltered." The opening paragraph, as follows, is worthy of earnest consideration: "The Feminist propaganda—which should not be confounded with the Suffrage agitation—rests upon a revolutionary biological principle. Substantially, the Feminists argue that there are no men and that there are no women: there are only sexual

majorities. To put the matter less obscurely, the Feminists base themselves on Weininger's theory, according to which the male principle may be found in Woman and the female principle in Man. It follows that they recognize no masculine or feminine 'spheres' and that they propose to identify absolutely the conditions of the sexes." Again, "An essential difference between 'Feminism' and 'Suffragism' is that Suffrage is but part of the greater propaganda." We note that this Suffrage agitation, which is even now upon us, is but the thin edge of the wedge which is destined to open the way for the revolutionary changes promised by the Feminist. "Generally, then, the Feminists are in opposition to most of the world institutions. Their case against the treatment of woman covers every form of human relation; the arts, the home, the trades and marriage," and revolutionary changes are proposed in each. The first three receive but passing notice, but it is with marriage they propose to play the greatest havoc. To quote Mr. George, "Though they are not in the main prepared to advocate free union, they are emphatically arrayed against modern marriage, which they look upon as slave union." "Personally," he continues, "I am inclined to believe that the ultimate aim of Feminism with regard to marriage is the practical suppression of marriage and the institution of free alliance. It may be that thus only can woman develop her own personality. . . ." Indications are, according to Mr. George, not wanting to show the rise of a state of society where man will not figure in the life of woman except as the father of her child. In closing, we are told that "we must not consider woman as she was, but woman as she is becoming," and we shudder at the prospect, while wondering at the audacity of the author.

IN passing it is well to note the uplifting influence of the Suffrage propagandists, as a prophecy of what we may expect in the millenium of Woman Suffrage. The annual report of the New York City Superintendent of Schools states that the dances, such as the tango, turkey trot, grizzly bear, etc., have been reduced to a minimum in the mixed dances under the auspices of the educational authorities, yet it is reported that at the headquarters of the Woman Suffrage party at 106th street and Lexington avenue, the tango is taught on Sunday afternoons to the young folk of the neighborhood. The end apparently justifies the means, as when the teacher was asked, her views on Sunday tango dancing, the reported reply was, "If it amuses the young folks we'll have all their mothers with us." Again, we read of the stamp of Suffrage approval upon "The Inside of the White Slave Traffic," a motion picture film for which it is the aim of the manager to get legal sanction. With a commendable eye to advertising, this manager enlisted in his defence three of the leading Suffragists, who are far from averse to coming before the public. All were favorable to its production and the old story of the usefulness of such exhibitions as a warning was brought to the fore. Miss Margaret Luther, whose experience as Secretary of the Florence Crittenden Home might be thought to carry some weight, is said to claim that such pictures might be dangerous for certain types of girls. Have we gone so far from sane reasoning that experience is to be overruled by notoriety seekers?

Today and Tomorrow

By Margaret Doane Gardiner

Dame Nature sat at Time's wide gate
And watched her children passing by.
"Today" came through with air elate,
With smile, self-pleased, and fearless eye,
Vaunting herself as brave and true,
Heir of the ages,—and sole heir too!

Dame Nature heard her triumph song:
How she was "equal to tyrant man,"
How she would govern to right all wrong,
And how a "broadening" life she'd plan
In politics and industry,
For modern women, such as she.

Dame Nature heard the maiden flout
The mother-stock from which she rose,
As "slaves downtrodden." Ne'er a doubt
But she was finer far than those!
"Today" cared only for "Today."
And Nature let her have her say.

Dame Nature sat by the narrow gate
That guards Posterity's long Way.
Serene, assured and up-to-date,
There entered smiling, fair "Today."
Dame Nature barred the road ahead.
"I do not need you here," she said.

"What,—with my education wide,
My work in government, my fame
As a reformer!" — "Bah, your pride
Is quite misplaced," replied the Dame.
"I've MEN these outer things to do.
Tomorrow has no need of you.

"Through patient ages, while men fought
For mental and material life,
True Womanhood I slowly taught
To draw aside from faction's strife,
And gave her power FROM WITHIN
The Spirit from the Brute to win.

But you turned back from this your task,
The hard, unnoticed, inner work,
And with man's weapons sought to mask
Your spirit-sword laid down to shirk.
But, while man's race you tried to run,
Who did the work you left undone?"

"I had a husband," quoth "Today,"
"But him I left, because you see
His needs and wants I feared would slay
My Individuality.
My child I reared with wisest care.
He surely needs his mother there."

Dame Nature smiled. "The system cold
You trained him by, was perfect quite.
But that strong staff you see him hold,
That lifts him up from height to height,
Is the remembered light of eyes
That shone with silent sacrifice,—

"Not yours, "Today!" The bold eyes fell.
"I did my part. A son I bore,
And lived my public life as well."
"Ay," said the Dame, "But, now, no more
Shall you have children, for I need
The best, my human best to breed.

"Strive on 'Today,' amid the mass,
Self-satisfied and hard of face,
But through this Gate you shall not pass.
For strength to mother my new race,
I'll not take dregs that may remain
From your political campaign."

Rossiter Johnson's Address Before Committee on Rules, House of Representatives

December 5, 1913.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND GENTLEMEN OF THE COMMITTEE:—

St. Paul's oft-quoted remark is pertinent to many occasions: "All things are lawful, but not all things are expedient." The sole object of those who ask for the appointment of a Committee on Suffrage is, that they may induce such committee to report in favor of a suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution. There is no question that the appointment of such a committee would be lawful, nor any question that the adoption of such an amendment might conform to the letter of the law. But let us consider whether it would be expedient.

One of the best tests of the expediency of any proposal is found by considering the effects of its opposite. Suppose, then, that no such amendment of our Constitution is ever proposed or ever adopted by a vote of the States. What State would be robbed of any rights, or hindered in the management of its own internal affairs? Any State that desires Woman Suffrage is at liberty to have it, without any amendment of the Federal Constitution or any action of Congress whatever. Several States already have such Suffrage, and any or all the others can have it when they want it. It is perfectly clear, then, that no harm can result to any State if Congress declines to take any action bearing on the question of Woman Suffrage.

Now let us suppose that Congress does submit the proposed amendment to a vote of the States—what are the probable and possible consequences? Nobody has a right to assume that all the States would vote in favor of it, and nobody supposes that all the States would so vote. The Constitution provides that if three-fourths of the States vote in favor of an amendment, that amendment becomes a part of the Constitution and is binding on all. We have forty-eight States in our Union; and therefore, if an amendment is proposed to them, it is possible for thirty-six that want it, not only to have it themselves but to force it on twelve that do not want it. In the present case, it is not only conceivable but probable that twelve that would vote against the amendment are these:

State	Population by Latest Census
Georgia,	2,609,121
Indiana,	2,700,876
Kentucky,	2,289,905
Michigan,	2,810,173
Missouri,	3,293,335
New Jersey,	2,537,167
New York,	9,113,279
North Carolina,	2,206,287
Ohio,	4,767,121
Pennsylvania,	7,665,111
Texas,	3,896,542
Massachusetts,	3,366,416
	47,255,333

The combined population of these States is more than 47,000,000, which exceeds by more than 3,000,000 the combined population of the other thirty-six

States. Here, then, if you consider it in its personal bearings, you would have a minority forcing upon a majority a radical measure to which they are opposed. The vote of Nevada, with fewer than 100,000 inhabitants, would offset that of New York, which has 9,000,000.

Furthermore, it is not necessary to the argument that there should be twelve States voting in the negative. Let us suppose that there is just one State that is opposed to such amendment. It would be pertinent for that State to say to the others: "Have Woman Suffrage if you want it, in your own borders, all forty-seven of you, by providing for it in your own State Constitutions; but why need you force it upon us who do not want it?" And that would be unanswerable.

The Federal Constitution very properly makes provision for its own amendment. But from the care with which it discriminates between rights granted to it and rights retained by the States, it is evident that it contemplates amendment in such matters only as are necessarily uniform throughout the Union—like, for instance, the recent amendment for a tax on incomes. If uniformity is not necessary, the matter clearly should be left to the option of the several States. And we all know that varying circumstances make wide differences among the States in regard to the desirability of Woman Suffrage.

Finally, such an amendment would prevent any State from ridding itself of Woman Suffrage if, after trial, it found the experiment a failure and a hindrance to its welfare. That this is conceivable, is shown by the fact that already in one Suffrage State there is strong indication of an early movement for the abolition of Woman Suffrage.

Gentlemen, let us all cheerfully obey the spirit of the Constitution, and leave this matter to the option of the several States.

The Home-Maker

By Lilian Dynevor Rice

I kiss my hand to the morning star,
  And call "Arise!" to the sun.
Off on my orbit I've swung afar
  E'er he has his course begun.

Through opened windows the breeze, new born,
  Comes rollicking, fragrant, free,
And all the glories of early morn
  Are glowing for mine and me.

In cheerful kitchen the kettle sings,
  There's sizzle, there's sav'ry smell,
And all of the little homey things
  Are doing their duties well.

Under the magic of my hands two
  The wheat flour turns to bread,
The brown beans change to a nectar brew,
  And so are my loved ones fed.

A kiss for my good man at the gate—
  That never his love flame cool;
A swift carress for each curly pate—
  To shorten the road to school.

And then while my broom and needle fly,
  And my washtub sparkles foam,
I sing, "Oh, blessed of women, I!
  For I am the Heart of Home!"

—The Times.

"Man and woman are alien—never yet has anyone conceived how alien."—Nietzscke.

Woman's Part in Civilization

Translated from the French of Georges Bigot by J. T. W.

SINCE THE beginning of time women have played an important part in the history of humanity, since earliest times they have taken an enormous share in the work of civilization—Septanaux says that they have never let pass any social event without having mingled with it their passion and their genius. Above all in the sixteenth century in that great intellectual movement which upset Europe and signalled the rebirth of the human spirit, their influence was remarkable. It should be told by what acts and what works women have created for themselves a place in politics and literature. For in political and literary life, they have followed a line of development and progress from which they have not wandered since that time up to the present, and their evolution is not without instruction and magnificence.

Today women are asking more than ever for a part in public affairs, and they demand even the honor of participating in the defense of their country.

Mme. Dieulafoy solicited lately from the minister of war permission to organize a feminine militia, destined to replace the stronger sex in a number of cases. In a lecture given lately on the social action of women, M. F. de Witt Guizot suggested another means of employing the good will of women in case of mobilization.

"Have you asked yourselves," asked the eminent lecturer, "what would become of the private interests in time of war? What would become of the business of which your husband is head?

"Why don't you find out what useful work you could organize in your neighborhood in case of war?

"Why not very quietly count on what you would do in the eventuality of a war of which they talk more than ever since it was declared impossible? This learned, your action will transform itself, and, if I am permitted so to speak, ladies, will be sanctified, and in preparing for your duty in time of war, you will also learn how to act for the good of society in time of peace.

"You will thus naturally become the apostles of physical and moral hygiene, because you will have studied how to conduct this combat, which, like all combats, has its rules.

"Thus, ladies, you will become the sentinels stationed at the fore-front of the fight which must be made today against three evils which are draining the life blood of France—infant mortality, alcoholism and tuberculosis.

"Infant mortality?

"Yes, there die in France every year 120,000 children between the ages of one and three. It is said that if certain elementary rules of hygiene were observed, seventy-five per cent of these children could be saved to France. Make of yourselves, then, indefatigable agents in this devoted work of preservation, which can give back to your country every year as

many people as inhabit the city of Orleans. You will thus keep up the balance of the race, for healthy men may be made of these children.

"After the child, turn your attention to the youth and teach him how one may aid the wonderful work of nature by not contradicting it. And then turn to the man and fight against alcoholism, remembering that death lurks behind each bottle of absinthe or "36." Make war on this poison which is degrading and reducing the race. Then you will fight against tuberculosis, which last year caused in France 153,000 deaths, and takes each year as many people as there are in the city of Toulouse.

"In truth, everything is connected. Think only that in carrying on war against tuberculosis, alcoholism and infant mortality you will be giving back to France millions of human beings, millions of money, and hundreds of thousands of strong soldiers.

"In ten years, ladies, you can give an entire province.

"There is, in fact, a really good work, a part which belongs to woman, and since it will soon be five centuries since one woman saved France, why have we not the right to expect that much from the united women of today?" . . .

This ends the remarks of Messrs. Bigot and Guizot. We would merely make the comment that as usual the feminist proposal is indirect. If France needs an army corps, which it is obvious she does, (her population now being one million lower than any other great power and showing an increase of only thirteen million in two hundred years, as against an increase in England of twenty-eight million and in Germany of twenty-nine million, Russia having gained one hundred and one million in the same length of time) we would suggest that M. Guizot is right, and that preserving life is more useful than forming a militia. And if we boldly go a step beyond M. Guizot's boldest assertion, we might even say that creating life is the most direct measure of all in a case like the present. But in no case can destruction be part of woman's high mission except in defense, when she has always done her part and always will. Mme. Dieulafoy's suggestion is wildly unpractical, for, as M. Guizot says, a woman's work of preservation (he does not mention creation) represents many soldiers, whereas her personal services would only represent one, very inferior, moreover, in physical capacity to endure hardship.

Suffrage Committee Held Up

Members of the House Committee on Rules, at Washington, said, on December 15, that because of the urgent business to come before it there will be a delay of more than a month before action is taken on the arguments of Suffragists and Anti-Suffragists for and against the creation of a standing committee on Woman's Suffrage in the House.

A formal vote on it is not expected before January 15 or 20 at the earliest. The stenographic reports of the hearings are now in the hands of the women who addressed the committee, and it will be a week or ten days before the material can be printed and circulated among members of the House.

A Parallel

LARGE amounts of money are appropriated every year by several religious denominations to establish and maintain, in foreign lands, missionaries who devote their lives to the propagation of Christianity. Suppose that one of those missionaries, in her annual report to the Board that sent her out, should write to this effect:—

"After some difficulty, I succeeded in making a friend of the chief of the Boo-boo tribe. By a system of cajolery and skillful flattery, I have induced him to issue a decree that the entire tribe shall at once embrace Christianity. Not one of them dared refuse; for absolute power is in his hands. This was a great triumph for our holy religion, and it adds five thousand converts to our denomination.

"As soon as this was accomplished, I visited the next tribe, the Bang-whangs. Here the chief was not so compliant, but I brought him to his senses with a threat that unless he issued the Christian decree without delay, I would stir up an insurrection in the tribe, which would probably cost him his head. The decree went out the next day, and that gives us seven thousand more converts.

"Next week I shall interview the chief of a third tribe, and I hope to have equal success."

If such were the report, how much money would be found in the next collection for foreign missions?

If the advocates of Woman Suffrage are sincere, no one will question their right to preach their doctrines and convert, by fair, honest argument, as many of their fellow citizens as they can. But, instead of this, by far the greater part of their efforts are spent in cajoleries, threats and trickery, to induce legislators to force upon the women of a State something that the great majority do not want. And when, by such means, they have succeeded in any State, they proclaim far and wide that they have won a notable victory for a sacred principle, whereas it is merely a temporary success of charlatanism. Their action presents a close parallel to that of the supposititious missionary quoted above. The most recent case in point is the threat of Dr. Anna Howard Shaw that all Congressmen who will not pledge themselves to vote for the proposed Suffrage amendment shall be boycotted and deprived of any chance of re-election.

A Pillar of the Republic

By Rev. James Elmer Russell

I have had a new admiration for General Ulysses S. Grant since I read this incident connected with his trip to Europe. While in France the President of the French Republic invited him to witness certain horse races on Sunday. Very courteously General Grant declined, saying, "It is not in accordance with the custom of my country or with the spirit of my religion to spend Sunday in that way."

The Woman Socialist and the Woman Suffragette

By F. G. R. Gordon

THE WOMAN SOCIALIST, written by Mrs. Ethel Snowden, wife of one of the leading Socialists of England, and recently published, has been written with the object of defending Woman Suffrage and Socialism jointly. Mrs. Snowden paints her uplifting picture of female voters thus: "The woman and the man in their simple beautiful home, lovely children at their knees . . . proceeding, side by side, to record their respective opinions at the ballot-box in perfect peace and amity." The Woman Socialist, like all Socialist works, is largely a criticism of the existing regime, but there are some mighty important things in this book, however. In her chapter on "Sex" she tells us that if Socialism stands for free-love, then we ought to fight it, yet most English Socialists admit that Socialism tends toward that very thing. Thomas Kirkup, the English-Socialist historian, in the Encyclopedia Britannica, says that: "In the Marx school there is a tendency to denounce the legally binding contract in marriage."

But Mrs. Snowden does tell us that divorce "will be made more easy of accomplishment." And on pages 60-61 she says: "It is more than probable that the ordinary church marriage service will be abolished . . . Under Socialism the marriage service will probably be a simple declaration on the part of the contracting parties before the civil representatives of the State." And she also says that the coming of Socialism will not mean a destruction of the "reign of lust and license."

This author supposes that the terrible evil of prostitution will disappear with the advent of Socialism, but she hastens to explain herself in these words: "But if, as at present, the 'unfortunate woman' be regarded as a necessity in these days of advanced thought and increased opportunities, then her status must be raised . . . she will be held to be performing a necessary social service." So then, the prostitute may not disappear, under Socialism, but merely be accorded a higher social status!

This Socialist author tells us that marriage will be regulated by the State. Mrs. Snowden tells us in her last chapter that the "Enfranchisement of women is an absolutely necessary part of the establishment of Socialism." Thus we are told by this Socialist-woman author that Woman Suffrage must come in order that we may establish the Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth and, in addition to this, she tells us that the children, after the first few years, will be regarded as the wards of the State and that they will "not be allowed to work for wages or anything but their own instruction." Mrs. Snowden says that "Socialist mothers will take charge of the very early years," for the upbringing of children. She tells us that there will be no function under Socialism and with "free women," that man does, that women will not do also, but, in order to bring about this heaven-on-earth-Socialism with the red-flag regime, we must first have won Woman Suffrage. That's all, and that's enough.

Report of the Hearing Before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives

WASHINGTON, December 5, 1913.

The hearing just held before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives was granted in order that the committee might decide how to report concerning the proposition whether a special Suffrage Committee should be appointed in the house to consider the general question of Woman Suffrage. There is such a committee in the Senate, but the Committee on the Judiciary has thus far had charge of the matter. The result of the appointment of such a special committee in the Senate has been that a "packed" committee has been appointed—that is a committee from Suffrage States known to favor Woman Suffrage. This, of course, is exactly contrary to the supposed democratic provision of equal rights to all and special favors to none, but, alas, the many recent efforts by Suffrage sentiment to break the Constitution has resulted, thus far, in making some serious cracks in its once noble and harmonious shape.

It was well argued by Anti-Suffragists that if a House Committee was decided upon it should not be formed in such manner. That, in the first place, no one from a Suffrage State should be placed on that committee as a State having Suffrage need no longer discuss the question, and, secondly, that it should represent no preponderating opinion on either side, but be open for full and fair discussion. The action of the committee has not yet been announced.

The Suffragists and the opposition both made the occasion one of a general discussion of the question of Woman Suffrage. Thursday, December 4, was taken up by the many organizations composing the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage. Among the many excellent speakers who commanded the attention of the committee were Mrs. A. J. George, of Brookline, and Mrs. Robert Garrett of Baltimore. Mr. Everett P. Wheeler, of New York represented the Man-Suffrage League of New York State, spoke on Thursday afternoon. The Guidon Club represented independent organizations, like itself. The hearing accorded its speakers was held on the morning of Friday, December 5. They were four in number:—Mrs. William Forse Scott, of Yonkers, who, as Chairman of the Guidon's Legislative Committee, was in charge of the hearing, made an opening address. She was followed by Mrs. Rossiter Johnson, Dr. Rossiter Johnson and then by Mr. John C. Ten Eycke, of Yonkers, who made a most effective address. The most striking feature of the hearing, to an outsider, was the revelation made of the Suffrage movement. The Suffragists took the center front of the room. They removed their hats (many of them) and seated themselves with an air of possession that did not appear consistent with good breeding. During an address by their opponents a large Suffrage map was brought in by two women, who planted

themselves in the middle front with the map supported across their knees. So glaring a breach of propriety and parliamentary usage called forth instant rebuke from the chairman, who said: "Take that map away!" Being of the unruly movement, they sat with it in the same position throughout the fine address of the Hon. Mr. Hefflin, of Alabama, an orator of the old school.

The meeting was hardly adjourned when up-sprung chits of girls with apron pockets full of flame, within and without —and thrust "Votes for Women," and other inflamable matter upon the out-going audience. It was very suggestive of what the dignified halls of legislation would look like if women politicians had their way and were there "to stay." Fortunately, such behavior is not apt to aid them. It was certainly a very fine hearing and a day and a half of well-spent time.

Too Much Independence

The appointment in many parts of the country of policewoman and the prominence that is now being given to the work of juvenile authorities suggests the uncomfortable reflection that the vaunted independence of the American girl has been carried a little too far. The girl who is free to decide for herself at what hour of the night she will go home, with whom she will consort and upon what terms, the precise style of her dress or of her undress, and the extent to which she may indulge in animal dances, may not be quite such an ornament to our civilization as we have supposed. The prominence now being given to the policewoman and the juvenile authority may be an indication that the pendulum is about to swing the other way, and, of course, it will swing too far. The new officialism is likely to regard itself as a sort of earthly providence empowered to impose the discipline of a ladies' seminary upon the juvenile population at large. Unfortunately it is our habit to select all ways of doing things except the right way, and so we may awake too late to the fact that policewomen and juvenile authorities are mighty bad substitutes for home discipline and home training.—San Francisco Argonaut.

Suffrage Not Necessary

In the colonies, and undeveloped countries generally, where women are in a minority and where, owing to the fact that all have an opportunity of marrying, there are not, for women, any difficult, economic and physical conditions, there is no woman's question; and by consequence no female legislative reformer or feminist. The woman voter follows as the opportunist politicians, who unfranchised her, intended, the lead of her men folks—serving only as a pawn in the game of politics. Under such conditions Woman's Suffrage leaves things as they are except only that it undermines the logical foundations of the law, and still further debases the standard of public efficiency and public morality.—Sir Almonth E. Wright, in The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage.

Sir Almoth E. Wright's Famous Letter To the London Times

Quoted from "The Unexpurgated Case Against Woman Suffrage

To the Editor of The Times:

SIR:—For man the physiological psychology of woman is full of difficulties.

He is not a little mystified when he encounters in her periodically recurring phases of hypersensitiveness, unreasonableness, and loss of the sense of proportion.

He is frankly perplexed when confronted with a complete alteration of character in a woman who is child-bearing.

When he is a witness of the "tendency of woman to morally warp when nervously ill," and of the terrible physical havoc which the pangs of a disappointed love may work, he is appalled.

And it leaves on his mind an eerie feeling when he sees serious and long-continued mental disorders developing in connection with the approaching extinction of a woman's reproductive faculty.

No man can close his eyes to these things; but he does not feel at liberty to speak of them.

For the woman that God gave him is not his to give away.

As for woman herself, she makes very light of any of these mental upsettings.

She perhaps smiles a little at them.*

* In the interests of those who feel that female dignity is compromised by it, I have here omitted a woman's flippant overestimate of the number of women in London society who suffer from nervous disorders at the climacteric.

None the less, these upsettings of her mental equilibrium are the things that a woman has most cause to fear; and no doctor can ever lose sight of the fact that the mind of woman is always threatened with danger from the reverberations of her physiological emergencies.

It is with such thoughts that the doctor lets his eyes rest upon the Militant Suffragist. He cannot shut them to the fact that there is mixed up with the Woman's movement much mental disorder; and he cannot conceal from himself the physiological emergencies which lie behind.

The recruiting field for the Militant Suffragists is the million of our excess female population—that million which had better long ago have gone out to mate with its complement of men beyond the sea.

Among them there are the following different types of woman:—(a) First—let us put them first—come a class of women who hold, with minds otherwise unwarped, that they may, whenever it is to their advantage, lawfully resort to physical violence.

The program, as distinguished from the methods, of these women is not very different from that of the ordinary Suffragist woman.

(b) There file past next a class of women who have all their life-long been strangers to joy, women in whom instincts

long suppressed have in the end broken into flame. These are the sexually embittered women in whom everything has turned into gall and bitterness of heart, and hatred of men.

Their legislative program is license for themselves, or else restrictions for man.

(c) Next there file past the incomplete. One side of their nature has undergone atrophy, with the result that they have lost touch with their living fellow men and women.

Their program is to convert the whole world into an epicene institution—an epicene institution in which man and woman shall everywhere work side by side at the selfsame tasks and for the selfsame pay.

These wishes can never by any possibility be realized. Even in animals—I say EVEN, because in these at least one of the sexes has periods of complete quiscence—male and female cannot be safely worked side by side, except when they are incomplete.

While in the human species safety can be obtained, it can be obtained only at the price of continual constraint.

And even then women, though she protests that she does not require it, and that she does not receive it, practically always does receive differential treatment at the hands of man.

It would be well, I often think, that every woman should be clearly told—and the woman of the world will immediately understand—that when man sets his face against the proposal to bring in an epicene world, he does so because he can do his best work only in surroundings where he is perfectly free from suggestion and from restraint, and from the onus which all differential treatment imposes.

And I may add in connection with my own profession that when a medical man asks that he should not be the yokefellow of a medical woman he does so also because he would wish to keep up as between men and women—even when they are doctors—some of the modesties and reticences upon which our civilization has been built up.

Now the medical woman is of course never on the side of modesty,* or in favor of any of any reticences. Her desire for knowledge does not allow of these.

(d) Inextricably mixed up with the types which we have been discussing is the type of woman whom Dr. Leonard William's recent letter brought so distinctly before our eyes—the woman who is poisoned by her misplaced self-esteem; and who flies out at every man who does not pay homage to her intellect.

She is the woman who is affronted when a man avers that FOR HIM the glory of woman lies in her power of attraction, in her capacity for motherhood, and in unswerving allegiance to the ethics which are special to her sex.

I have heard such an intellectually embittered woman say, though she had been self-denyingly taken to wife, that "never in the whole course of her life had a man ever as much as done her a kindness."

The program of this type of woman is, as a preliminary, to compel man to admit her claim to be his intellectual equal; and, that done, to compel him to divide up everything with her to the last farthing, and so make her also his financial equal.

* To those who have out of inadvertence and as laymen and women misunderstood, it may be explained that the issue here discussed is the second in order of the three which are set out on p. 139 (supra).

And her journals exhibit to us the kind of parliamentary representative she desiderates. He, humbly, hat in hand, asks for his orders from a knot of washerwomen standing arms akimbo.†

(e) Following in the wake of these embittered human beings come troops of girls just grown up.

All these will assure you, these young girls—and what is seething in their minds is stirring also in the minds in the girls in the colleges and schools which are staffed by unmarried suffragists—that woman has suffered all manner of indignity and injustice at the hands of man.

And these young girls have been told about the intellectual, and moral, and financial value of woman—such tales as it never entered into the heart of man to conceive.

The program of these young women is to be married upon their own terms. Man shall—so runs their scheme—work for their support—to that end giving up his freedom, and putting himself under orders, for many hours of the day; but they themselves must not be asked to give up any of their liberty to him; or to subordinate themselves to his interests, or to obey him in anything.

To obey A MAN would be to commit the unpardonable sin.

It is not necessary, in connection with a movement which proceeds on the lines set out above, any further to labor the point that there is in it an element of mental disorder. It is plain that it is there.

There is also a quite fatuous element in the programs of the Militant Suffragist. We have this element, for instance, in the doctrine that, notwithstanding the fact that the conditions of the labor market deny it to her, women ought to receive the same wage as a man for the same work.

This doctrine is fatuous, because it leaves out of sight that, even if woman succeeds in doing the same work as man, he has behind him a much larger reserve of physical strength. As soon as a time of strain comes, a reserve of strength and freedom from periodic indisposition is worth paying extra for.

Fatuous also is the dogma that woman ought to have the same pay for the same work—fatuous because it leaves out of sight that woman's commercial value in many of the best fields of work is subject to a very heavy discount by reason of the fact that she cannot, like a male employee work cheek by jowl with a male employer; nor work among men as a man with his fellow employes.

So much for the Woman Suffragist's protest that she can conceive of no reason for a differential rate of pay for man.

Quite as fatuous are the marriage projects of the Militant Suffragist. Every woman of the world could tell her—whispering it into her private ear—that if a sufficient number of men should come to the conclusion that it was not worth their while to marry except on the terms of fair give-and-take, the Suffragist woman's demands would have to come down.

It is not at all certain that the institution of matrimony—which, after all, is the great instrument in the levelling up of the financial situation of woman—can endure apart from some willing subordination on the part of the wife.

It will have been observed that there

†I give, in response to a request, the reference: Votes for Women, March 18, 1910, p. 381.

is in these programs, in addition to the element of mental disorder and to the element of the fatuous, which have been animadverted upon, also a very ugly element of dishonesty. In reality the very kernel of the Militant Suffrage movement is the element of immorality.

There is here not only immorality in the ends which are in view, but also in the methods adopted for the attainment of those ends.

We may restrict ourselves to indicating wherein lies the immorality of the methods.

There is no one who does not discern that woman in her relations to physical force stands in quite a different position to man.

Out of that different relation there must of necessity shape itself a special code of ethics for woman. And to violate that code must be for woman immorality.

So far as I have seen, no one in this controversy has laid his finger upon the essential point in the relations of woman to physical violence.

It has been stated—and in the main quite truly stated—that woman in the mass cannot, like man, back up her vote by bringing physical force into play.

But the Woman Suffragist here counters by insisting that she as an individual may have more physical force than an individual man.

And it is quite certain—and it did not need Suffragist raids and window-breaking riots to demonstrate it—that woman in the mass can bring a certain amount of physical force to bear.

The true inwardness of the relation in which woman stands to physical force lies not in the question of her having it at command, but in the fact that she cannot put it forth without placing herself within the jurisdiction of an ethical law.

The law against which she offends when she resorts to physical violence is not an ordinance of man; it is not written in the statutes of any State; it has not been enunciated by any human lawgiver. It belongs to those unwritten, and unassailable, and irreversible commandments of religion . . . which we suddenly and mysteriously become aware of when we see them violated.

The law which the Militant Suffragist has violated is among the ordinances of that code which forbade us even to think of employing our native Indian troops against the Boers; which brands it as an ignominy when a man leaves his fellow in the lurch and saves his own life; and which makes it an outrage for a man to do violence to a woman.

To violate any ordinance of that code is more dishonorable than to transgress every statutory law.

We see acknowledgement of it in the fact that even the uneducated man in the street resents it as an outrage to civilization when he sees a man strike a blow at a woman.

But to the man who is committing the outrage it is a thing simply unaccountable that any one should fly out at him.

In just such a case is the Militant Suffragist. She cannot understand why anyone should think civilization is outraged when she scuffles in the street mud with a policeman.

If she asks for an explanation, it perhaps behooves a man to supply it.

Up to the present in the whole civilized world there has ruled a truce of God as between man and woman. That truce is

based upon the solemn covenant that within the frontiers of civilization (outside them of course the rule lapses) the weapon of physical force may not be applied by man against woman; nor by woman against man.

Under this covenant, the reign of force which prevails in the world without comes to an end when a man enters his household.

Under this covenant that half of the human race which most needs protection is raised up above the waves of violence.

Within the terms of this compact everything that woman has received from man, and everything man receives from woman, is given as a free gift.

Again, under this covenant a full half of the program of Christianity has been realized; and a foundation has been laid upon which it may be possible to build higher; and perhaps finally in the ideal future to achieve the abolition of physical violence and war.

And it is this solemn covenant, the covenant so faithfully kept by man, which has been violated by the Militant Suffragist in the interest of her morbid, stupid, ugly and dishonest programs.

Is it a wonder if men feel that they have had enough of the Militant Suffragist, and that the State would be well rid of her if she were crushed under the soldiers' shields like the traitor woman at the Tarpeian rock?

We may turn now to that section of Woman Suffragists—one is almost inclined to doubt whether it any longer exists—which is opposed to all violent measures, though it numbers in its ranks women who are stung to the quick by the thought that man, who will concede the vote to the lowest and most degraded of his own sex, withholds it from "even the noblest woman in England."

When that excited and somewhat pathetic appeal is addressed to us, we have only to consider what a vote really gives.

The parliamentary vote is an instrument—and a quite astonishingly disappointing instrument it is—for obtaining legislation; that is, for directing that the agents of the State shall in certain defined circumstances bring into application the weapon of physical compulsion.

Further, the vote is an instrumennt by which we give to this or that group of statesmen authority to supervise and keep in motion the whole machinery of compulsion.

To take examples. A vote cast in favor of a bill for the prohibition of alcohol—if we could find opportunity for giving a vote on such a question—would be a formal expression of our desire to apply, through the agency of the paid servants of the State, that same physical compulsion which Mrs. Carrie Nation put into application in her "bar-smashing" crusades.

And a vote which puts a government into office in a country where murder is punishable by death is a vote which, by agency of the hangman, puts the noose round the neck of every convicted murderer.

So that the difference between voting and direct resort to force is simply the difference between exerting physical violence in person, and exerting it through the intermediary of an agent of the State.

The thing, therefore, that is withheld from "the noblest woman in England," while it is conceded to the man who is lacking in nobility of character, is in the end only an instrument by which she

might bring into application physical force.

When one realizes that that same noblest woman of England would shrink from any personal exercise of violence, one would have thought that it would have come home to her that it is not precisely her job to commission a man forcibly to shut up a public-house, or to hang a murderer.

One cannot help asking oneself whether, if she understood what a vote really means, the noblest woman in England would still go on complaining of the bitter insult which is done to her in withholding the vote.

But the opportunist—the practical politician, as he calls himself—will perhaps here intervene, holding some such language as this:—"Granting all you say, granting, for the sake of argument, that the principle of giving votes to woman is unsound, and that evil must ultimately come of it, how can you get over the fact that no very conspicuous harm has resulted from Woman Suffrage in the countries which have adopted it? And can any firm reasons be rendered for the belief that the giving of votes to women in England would be any whit more harmful than in the Colonies?"

A very few words will supply the answer.

The evils of Woman Suffrage lie, first, in the fact that to give the vote to women is to give it to voters who as a class are quite incompetent to adjudicate upon political issues; secondly, in the fact that women are a class of voters who cannot effectively back up their votes by force; and, thirdly, in the fact that it may seriously embroil man and woman.

The first two aspects of the question have already in this controversy been adequately dealt with. There remains the last issue.

From the point of view of this issue the conditions which we have to deal with in this country are the absolute antithesis of those ruling in any of the countries and States which have adopted Woman Suffrage.

When Woman Suffrage was adopted in these countries it was adopted in some for one reason, in others for another. In some it was adopted because it appealed to the doctrinaire politician as the proper logical outcome of a democratic and Socialistic policy. In others it was adopted because opportunist politicians saw in it an instrument by which they might gain electioneering advantages. So much was this the case that it sometimes happened that the woman's vote was sprung upon a community which was quite unprepared and indifferent to it.

The cause of Woman Suffrage was thus in the countries of which we speak neither in its inception nor in its realization a question of revolt of Woman against the oppression of man. It had, and has, no relation to the programs of the Militant Suffragists as set out at the outset of this letter.

By virtue of this, all the evils which spring from the embroiling of man and woman have in the countries in question been conspicuously absent.

Instead of seeing himself confronted by a section of embittered and hostile women voters which might at any time outvote him and help to turn an election, man there sees his women folk voting practically everywhere in accordance with his directions, and lending him a hand to outvote his political opponent.

Whether or no such voting is for the good of the common weal is beside our present question. But it is clearly an arrangement which leads to amity and peace between a man and his womankind, and through these to good-will towards all women.

In England everything is different.

If Woman Suffrage comes in here, it will have come as a surrender to a very violent feminist agitation—an agitation which we have traced back to our excess female population and the associated abnormal physiological conditions.

If ever Parliament concedes the vote to woman in England, it will be accepted by the Militant Suffragist, not as an eirenicon, but as a victory which she will value only for the better carrying on of her fight a outrance against the oppression and injustice of man.

A conciliation with historical revolt is neither an act of peace; nor will it bring peace.

Nor would the conferring of the vote upon women carry with it any advantages from the point of view of finding a way out of the material entanglements in which woman is enmeshed, and thus ending the war between man and woman.

One has only to ask oneself whether or not it would help the legislator in remodelling the divorce or the bastardy laws if he had conjoined with him an unmarried Militant Suffragist as assessor.

Peace will come again. It will come when woman ceases to believe and teach all manner of evil of man despitefully. It will come when she ceases to impute to him as a crime her own natural disabilities, when she ceases to resent the fact that man cannot and does not wish to work side by side with her. And peace will return when every woman for whom there is no room in England seeks "rest" beyond the sea, "each one in the house of her husband," and when the woman who remains in England comes to recognize that she can, without sacrifice of dignity, give a willing subordination to the husband or father, who, when all is said and done, earns and lays up money for her.

A. E. WRIGHT.

March 27, 1912.

La Follette a Suffragist

Senator Robert M. La Follette, it is understood, is planning to come out during the approaching campaign as the open advocate for Woman Suffrage in Wisconsin and to make this question one of his cardinal planks. In fact, it is believed that he is willing that the coming battle between the La Follette people and the McGovern following shall be waged on the Woman Suffrage issue.

It is the idea of Senator La Follette that Governor McGovern will support the opposition to Woman Suffrage and that the question will thus become a definite dividing line between the two factions of the Republican party.

Wouldn't It, Sisters?

Ida, Gladys, I've been thinking
What a rank world this would be
If the women were all hikers
Such as you and Rosalie.
Or suppose they all were sluggers
Like the agile Christabel,
Window breakers, dwelling burners—
Wouldn't England be a—well,
A caminum ignis, place of fury;
A "stagnum ardentis sulphure?"

—Rochester Post Express.

Press News and Notes

At the last census there were in Australia about 4,500,000 inhabitants—just half the number in the State of New York—and the men preponderate by 233,000. We should naturally expect that domestic life would be more secure and statistics of vice very favorable to the home. Just the contrary is true. The percentage of illegitimacy is 6.23, as compared with the figures for England and Wales, which is but 4.00. In New South Wales (where women received the vote in 1902) there was a population of 1,645,455, with a majority of 102,834 men. The rate of illegitimacy there was at that time 7.04, and Mr. Stephen Murphy (a coroner) writing to The Daily Telegraph, of London, deplored the "enormous annual loss of life by criminal means"—infanticide. In Queensland, where women voted in 1905, the population in 1908-9 was 558,237, with a majority of 48,000 men. The illegitimacy returns from 1901 to 1906 had increased from 5.93 to 7.68.

The Australian women voters refuse to change the conditions by which some 2,000 married women teachers (many with husbands earning good salaries) continue to monopolize the positions that qualified single women are anxious to take in order to support themselves. Here is our problem, and it is beginning to be realized here that the married teacher question is only another phase of the feminist attack upon the home.

The women operatives of Lancashire and Yorkshire, England, have repeatedly voted in their unions against raising the age of the half-time children in the factories and mills from 12 to 13.

The following extract from a pamphlet by an English writer—H. B. Samuels—entitled "Woman Suffrage: Its Dangers and Delusions," is especially applicable to the present time of discussion of the Workingmen's Compensation act, in our own country and State. This act, like so many others of moment, is one that demands real statesmanship to deal with. All honorable business believes in the Employers' Liability act, but the Socialism that seems to underlie such a bill as that put forward by Gov. Glynn is both feared and dreaded. The trouble is that any objection urged against it is apt to raise a cry of capitalistic favoritism. As always, the Suffrage workers urge upon and for women such measures as joining trades unions, instead of endeavoring to aid them to individual effort in self-respecting demands. Woman is not an organizer by nature, the gift is exceptional with them, and they merely become supporters and tools of a giant movement.

The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1907 included (for the first time) domestic servants, who benefitted during 1908 in the same way as did the men employed in dangerous trades and occupations The Trade Boards Act, too, is a measure designed to assist the underpaid and sweated woman workers in various trades and callings, and only requires agitation and organization of the workers themselves to bring the price of their skill and industry to a higher level. The improved conditions of domestic service afford a striking example of what the law of supply and demand can bring about—without votes. Domestic servants today are much better treated and paid than formerly, and their wages are still going up owing to the increased demand for the services of really steady, industrious and conscientious young women. Agricultural laborers, however—with the vote—no matter how steady, industrious and conscientious, have to work for just as miserable wages now as before they got the vote in 1884. If it were true, as Suffragists contend, that the vote will help the workers to raise their wages, the poor laborers in every trade and industry in

the country would have gained every possible increase. But the cruel truth is that votes and wages are not related at all.

At the rally at the Brookline Town Hall, November 18, under the direction of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, the hall was filled to overflowing. Mrs. Henry P. White, chairman of the Brookline branch, spoke on "The Real Danger of Woman Suffrage and Socialism." She said in part: "Suffrage has been called the 'yellow peril,' but I believe it to be the 'red peril' in the 'yellow cloak.' Do you care to see private property abolished? Do you agree with Miss Ardley that wifehood is slavery? Do you think that the marriage ceremony is useless and ridiculous? Do you wish to have it done away with for a mutual understanding to be broken at will by either party? If you want these thing—then work for Woman Suffrage with the Socialists, but if you hold family relations as sacred, then work with all your might against the companion and forerunner of Socialism—Woman Suffrage."

John A. Sullivan, of the Boston Finance Commission, gave a brief resume of the coming to this country of Mrs. Pankhurst and then told of the article on the ballot at the State election, proposing an amendment to the constitution to permit women to act as notaries public. Its rejection by the voters, he said, meant, not that men believed it harmful, but as women are demanding the vote in such a way as to make it a menace to government, they felt it was time to check the movement.

Miss Lucy G. Price, of Cleveland, a Vassar graduate, and well known in Connecticut for her magnificent work against Suffrage, last spring, said that while "we think that men and women are equal, of course, and we women in the world have to do as important work as men are doing and have done it. We do not think it possible for us to take up their work without interfering with our own."

During these addresses several well known Suffragists were taking notes and distributing circulars to persons passing to the hall, announcing the address to be made by Mrs. Helen Ring Robinson, of Colorado. They also displayed an illuminated sign in front of the building, so that it met the eyes of all as they left the rally.

A new branch of the Connecticut Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage has been formed at Madison. The chairman is Miss Georgie Scranton and Miss Helen Hull, secretary.

Some Letters to "The Reply"

"The Last Word" on Suffrage

To the Editor of The New York Times:

A new magazine, opposing Woman Suffrage, comes from New Canaan, Conn., and is entitled THE REPLY. It reads like a very cogent publication, but why call it The Reply? As it is seeking subscribers, why not call it The Last Word? Then all the women, regardless of politics, would have it or explode in the effort. W. J. L.

New York, Nov. 26, 1913.

To the Editor:

Enclosed is the signature requested. I wish I could make NO louder. I am eighty this fall, so cannot do much, but my voice is against Suffragette work. I am writing to another magazine to withhold my subscription, though I have taken it almost from the first, on account of their publishing articles from Mrs. Pankhurst. I think it not within their province to force such odious utterances into our houses. THE REPLY is excellent.

MRS. D. W. BARTLETT.

West Haven, Conn., December 6, 1913.

London, November 18, 1913.

Editor of THE REPLY:

The colours of our League are not RED, black and white as the opponents in your country designate them, they are black, ROSE and white. The black and white are intended to show the difference between the actual and the ideal in life, and the rose colour running between them is the bright line of hope which links the two.

Yours truly,

HELEN PAGE, Assistant Secretary

Of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, London, Eng.

Book Reviews and Notes

THE UNEXPURGATED CASE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE. BY SIR ALMOTH WRIGHT, M.D., F.R.S. New York, Paul B. Hoeber, $1.00.

The author divides his volume into three parts. Part First is devoted to arguments from elementary natural rights; Part Second, to arguments from the intellectual grievances of woman; and, the third to arguments which take the form of "Counsels of Perfection" addressed to man.

Part Second: Arguments Against the Concession of Parliamentary Suffrage to Woman, Woman's Disability in the Matter of Intellect, and Woman's Disability in the Matter of Public Morality, Mental Outlook and Program of the Female Legislative Reformer, and The Ulterior Ends Which the Woman's Suffrage Movement Has in View.

Part Third: Palliatives or Correctives for the Discontent of Woman—and there is an appendix entitled Militant Hysteria.

It will be seen that this is an unusual and serious discussion, which it would take many pages to treat with any justice. All that can be done here is to comment on a single point under each head. Under the first head, he says: "Now, the term RIGHT denotes in its judicial sense a debt which is owed to us by the State. A right is created when the community binds itself to us." The author shows logically that no such right exists.

The second section contains the following pertinent remark: "The Suffragist misapprehends when she regards it as an indignity to obey laws which she has not herself framed, or specifically sanctioned. (The whole male electorate would here lie under the same indignity). It is a matter of felicitation that an expert body should have evolved a set of rules under which order and harmony are achieved. He points out that rules have grown, that legislative bodies are helped to do any thing but slowly alter them under disadvantages, and that the Suffrage cry of the vote to make or change laws is a fine proof of unfitness to understand the nature of law-making.

The author's argument from the fact of the necessity of force to make a government real is well put and unanswerable. He says: "An extension (of Suffrage) which takes in more men—whatever else it may do—makes for stability in the respect that it makes the decrees more irresistable. "The constant wail of Suffragists, "More MEN are admitted, THEREFORE more women should be," shows how unfitted women are to comprehend the fact that "An extension which takes in ANY women undermines the physical sanction of the laws."

The author points out that in woman's mental make up "mental images are overintimately linked with emotional reflex responses." This truth makes it impossible for woman to rely upon herself in matters where decisions turn upon broad generalizations. The author does not set forth the reasons. Man would be a mere repeating machine. The Creator therefore gifted with the imaginative and sympathetic capacity to enter the fancied world with the child and to do so from the viewpoint of experience. Here is the secret of mother and sisterhood. She can thus teach truth and mould the nature. And it is exactly this that makes her really dangerous as a politician, where imaginative and sympathetic playing are apt to lead to the real exercise of fraud. It will be realized that woman has already done herself and her sex incalculable wrong by so acting that in Suffrage States and Suffrage campaigns. She has made the impression of unreality, when she was only playing where work was demanded.

VOTES FOR MEN. Duffield & Company. 50 Cents.

Perhaps no little book has appeared on this much controverted question that has called-forth more of the personal feeling of the reader—whether a man or a woman.

Men of a high-type of feeling say: "I am ashamed of that book. I don't want my wife to read it and to think that men are like that."

A woman of the same high-type of feeling is apt to say: "I bought that book thinking that I had something very convincing and interesting for my son and daughter to read, and when I had glanced it over I put it away on the closet shelf for fear that they would see it." Both these people agreed that "the matter in itself was true and proper to be said, but the method of saying was repugnant to them."

This sentiment does honor to them, and yet it is unjust to the book. A husband and wife who knew the Suffrage movement well read the book aloud together, and said: "I am glad this book is in the world. It will do much good."

It is evidently the work of a physician, one of the rough and ready sort. There is little that is new in it, but its abruptness is just what makes it stick—like a burr, and the meat is still in the burr very often.

The most valuable part - because one seldom presented appears to be this: "We can't put our children in any sort of social machines and turn the crank and produce properly matured men and women. The results where this has been tried—where children have been raised in institutions—are too crying in their piteous failure to need comment. . . . We know that institution children die, not only infants but older children, at a rate of mortality not equaled by our vilest slums. For children cannot flourish mentally, cannot survive physically, without the warm energizing electricity of love."

"We are seeing at the present day, how even organized charity is rushing to place children committed to its care—the orphans and derelicts—in private homes, in families. No more institutions for them. It's not good enough for them, and it certainly is not good enough for our hearts dearest and best."

"If we are proposing to continue the human race upon the earth, we have got to stick to the good, old-fashioned institution of the home, with a good, old-fashioned mother on the job."

"The average over-muscled woman can't face childbirth as her weaker mother could—as our hospitals and clinics know. Can't nurse her offspring, if by chance she and it survive. No, not though she is six feet tall and can put the shot over any man on the campus. Even the male athlete knows the danger of muscular development at the expense of vital strength—much more so is the danger to woman whose temperament is vital, not muscular."

It might be noted here that the most serious attempts are now made to give "home" to the criminal class, as the means of their reform. Just at the time when Suffragists are repudiating home life and delicate and modest ways, these are the things sought by women nurses and students of vital statistics as THE things which alone can save the woman criminal. The cottage system for prisoners, companionship under good conditions so as to reproduce, as far as possible, the home, is the ideal sought for.

It must be remembered that while one of the "fads" of Feminism is the making much of the home, it is not the old-fashioned home of which the author speaks, not the imaginary affinity dwelling place where, as Ellen Keys says, the unmarried mother, must stand on an absolute par with the married in social esteem and treatment.

Anti-Suffrage Organizations

National Association
Opposed to Woman Suffrage

OFFICERS

Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, President, New York.
Mrs. Eli Whitney, Recording Secretary, New Haven
Mrs. Robert Garrett, Treasurer, Baltimore.
Miss Minnie Bronson, General Secretary, 37 West 39th street, New York.

STATE ASSOCIATIONS

CONNECTICUT

Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, President
" Walter S. Schulz, Secretary, 242 North Beacon street, Hartford

ILLINOIS

Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, President
Miss J. C. Fairfield, Treasurer, 1523 Dearborn ave., Chicago
Mrs. George W. Kretzinger, Recording Secretary

IOWA

Mrs. John Flynn, President
" Simon Casady, Secretary; 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines

MARYLAND

Mrs. Robert Garrett, President, Baltimore
Miss Catherine P. Davis, Cor. Sec., Baltimore

MAINE

Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Secretary, Portland

MASSACHUSETTS

Mrs. James M. Codman, President; Brookline
Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Corresponding Secretary 687 Boylston street, Boston

MICHIGAN

Mrs. Henry F. Lyster, President
Miss Helen E. Keep, Secretary; 753 Jefferson avenue, Detroit

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mrs. A. T. Dudley, President; Exeter
Miss Grace Morrill, Cor. Secretary; Concord

NEW JERSEY

Mrs. E. Yarde Brees, President
Miss Julia Minnegerode, Cor. Sec., Trenton

NEW YORK

Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, President
Mrs. M. E. Loomis, Secretary, 37 West 39th st.

OHIO

Mrs. H. E. Talbot, President, Dayton

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Horace Brock, President
" Brinton Coxe, Cor. Secretary; 1515 Spruce street, Philadelphia

VERMONT

Mrs. Brookes Brown, President
" M. H. Buckham, Secretary; Burlington

RHODE ISLAND

Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, President
" A. G. Harkness, Secretary, 7 Cooke street Providence

VIRGINIA

Miss Jane M. Rutherford, President
Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, Secretary; 1616 Grove avenue, Richmond

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mrs. Arthur W. Dunn, President; The Brighton
Miss C. L. Harrold, Secretary; 2101 N. street

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt, President
Miss Genevieve Mills, Corresponding Secretary 222 Monona avenue, Madison

---

THE GUIDON CLUB
Opposed to Woman Suffrage
45 East Thirty-fourth Street, New York

PRESIDENT

Mrs. Rossiter Johnson

VICE-PRESIDENTS

Mrs. William Forse Scott
Mrs. Charles Halbert Denison
Mrs. Charles F. W. Mielatz
Mrs. John Jerome Rooney

SECRETARY—Miss Edna K. Phillips

TREASURER—Mrs. Josephine Redding

HONORARY VICE-PRESIDENTS

James, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore
Rev. James M. Bruce, D. D.
Gen. James Lowell Carter
Hon. John D. Crimmins
Arthur Randolph Green, M. D.
Gen. Nelson H. Henry
John Bessner Huber, M. D.
Col. John P. Irish
Rossiter Johnson, LL. D.
Charles R. Lamb, Esq.
Hon. Aaron Jefferson Levy
Rev. Henry A. Stimson, D. D.
Theron George Strong, Esq.
Mrs. Martha Moore Avery
Mrs. Clarence Beebe
Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin
Mrs. Annie Nathan Meyer
Mrs. William Packer Prentice
Miss Mollie Elliott Seawell
Mrs. Henry Seligman
Mrs. Bayard Taylor
Mrs. E. Payson Terhune